

3. A reclining seat as claimed in claim 2, wherein said second ends of said first link and said second link are pivotally connected to respective opposite ends of said third link.

4. A reclining seat as claimed in claim 1, wherein said second ends of said first and second links are located inwardly of said seat back.

5. A reclining seat as claimed in claim 1, wherein said first and second links are located outwardly of said seat back.

6. A reclining seat as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a sector gear connected to said first end of said second link, and a worm gear rotatably mounted on said seat cushion and meshing with said sector gear, each of said sector gear and said worm gear having a lead angle greater than an angle of friction thereof, whereby when locking of said worm gear is released said seat back may be inclined by application of a force thereto.

7. A reclining seat as claimed in claim 6, wherein said worm gear includes a portion having external teeth, and further comprising a lock member mounted on said seat cushion and having internal teeth, said lock member being movable axially of said worm gear between a locked position, whereat said internal teeth mesh with said external teeth, and an unlocked position, whereat said internal teeth are out of mesh with said external teeth. --.

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Editorial amendments have been made to the specification.

The previous claims have been canceled and replaced by new claims 5-11.

The newly presented claims have been drafted in a manner that, it is submitted, obviates the various objections noted in the formal rejection of paragraph 1 of page 2 of the Office Action. In this regard, the Examiner's criticism of the term "angle of friction" is traversed. In fact, it is submitted that this term is well known and understood in the art. Thus, such term is defined as:

When an object A is placed on a plane B and when the plane B is being inclined, the angle of friction is the angle θ which the plane B forms with respect to the horizontal plane at the time the object A starts sliding. When the static coefficient of friction is represented by μ , the angle of friction is given by $\mu = \tan \theta$.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the newly presented claims are in proper form.

It is noted that the Examiner rejected previous claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Ritter. It respectfully is submitted however that the subject matter of the present invention, as embodied by the newly presented claims, and specifically by new independent claim 5, patentably distinguishes over the above reference.

Initially, new independent claim 5 essentially includes the limitations of previous claims 1 and 2. The invention particularly provides an arrangement for easy selective inclination of a reclining seat, whereby the prior art problems discussed in the specification are obviated. In particular accordance with the present invention, the center of rotation of the seat back 4 is located forwardly (relative to the front of the seat) of a center of rotation of a reclining mechanism employed to achieve inclination of the seat back.

More particularly in accordance with the present invention, the reclining mechanism employed for selectively inclining seat back 4 relative to seat cushion 2 includes first link 6 having a first end (the lower end shown in Figure 3) rotatably mounted on the seat cushion frame and defining a center of rotation of the inclining movement of seat back 4 relative to seat back 2, and a second link 8 having a first end (the lower end shown in Figure 3) rotatably mounted on the seat cushion frame to define a center of rotation of the reclining mechanism. First link 6 and second link 8 each are longitudinally rigid and non-extensible. Furthermore, the first center of rotation, i.e. the center of rotation of inclining movement of seat back 4 and defined by the lower end of first link 6, is located forwardly of the second center of rotation that defines the center of rotation

of the reclining mechanism. This relationship will be apparent from a consideration, particularly, of Figures 1, 3 and 8.

The above limitations are set forth in new independent claim 5, and such limitations are not anticipated by Ritter. Thus, the Examiner has equated arm 3, 4 of Ritter with the claimed first link and has equated elements 5, 6 of Ritter with the claimed second link. It is not the intention of Applicant to acquiesce to this interpretation by the Examiner. However, the limitations included in claim 5 manifestly patentably distinguish over this interpretation. Thus, it is critical to the operation of the Ritter device that elements 5, 6 be telescopic with respect to each other. Therefore, elements 5, 6 of Ritter do not and indeed cannot define a member that is "longitudinally rigid and non-extensible".

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that new independent claim 5 manifestly patentably distinguishes over Ritter. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event however that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Seiji KAWASAKI

By: 

Jeffrey Nolt

Registration No. 25,408

Attorney for Applicant

JN/pjm
Washington, D.C.
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 20, 1999